



## **HISTORIC DISTRICTS COMMISSION**

### **Meeting Minutes**

### **Thursday, March 17, 2016**

Pursuant to notice duly filed with the Town Clerk's office, the Town of Concord Historic Districts Commission held a public meeting on Thursday, March 17, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the First Floor Conference Room, 141 Keyes Road, Concord, Massachusetts.

Present:

#### **Full Members**

Terry Gregory, Chair  
Mark Giddings, Vice Chair  
Nea Glenn, Secretary

#### **Associate Members**

Luis Berrizbeitia  
Peter Nobile  
Melinda Shumway

Andrew W. Mara, Administrative Assistant

Mr. Gregory called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Voting Members for the meeting were Mr. Gregory, Mr. Giddings, Ms. Glenn, Mr. Berrizbeitia (continued hearings only), Mr. Nobile, and Ms. Shumway (new hearings only).

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Minutes of the February 11th, February 18th, and March 3rd meetings – The minutes for the February 11th, February 18th, and March 3rd meetings were not ready for review at this time.

Request for Time Extension – The Commission received a request from 25 Barnes Hill Road to extend Certificate 15-65 for new fencing. The Certificate was extended for six months.

#### **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

#### **45 Construction Company Inc. on behalf of Bank of America, 52 Main Street, Main Street Historic District, for paving**

Denise Cimino of 45 Construction Company Inc., appeared on behalf of Bank of America and presented the Application. Also in attendance was property manager Mike Kimball. The Applicant sought after-the-fact approval for gravel installed over mulch beds at 52 Main Street. The gravel bed was installed to prevent water from pooling and entering the building.

Ms. Cimino noted that at the initial hearing, the Commission indicated they would not approve the gravel bed as installed and that the Commission had urged her to consider other alternatives for the site. Ms. Cimino presented the Commission with a landscape plan that would remove the

gravel bed while also addressing the water problems. The Applicants reviewed the landscape plan. As part of the plan, the unapproved crushed stone gravel bed will be removed and replaced with approximately 3" of pine bark mulch. A weed barrier would be installed under the mulch. A drip edge would be installed along the edge of the building. A small strip of the new drip edge would extend diagonally out from the rear corner of the building to the existing curbing. The proposed drip edge will consist of approximately 6" of the existing gravel and has a surelock aluminum edge with a dark finish.

The Chair asked for comments from Commission Members. Several Commission members opined that the new landscape plan was a better option for the site than the gravel bed. At the request of a Commission member, the Applicants reconfirmed that existing gravel would be incorporated into the drip edge.

The Chair opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time. Mr. Giddings moved to approve the Application as revised per the landscape plan submitted. Ms. Glenn seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The Chair then signed and dated the approved landscape plan.

**Anne Elton, 415 Lowell Road, Barrett Farm Historic District, to convert deck into screened porch, and for new pool/hot tub, pool house with pergola, landscaping, retaining walls and steps, fencing, paving, windows, and lighting**

Joshua Bath of Nashawtuc Architects and Rob Flaherty of Redmond Design Group appeared for the continued hearing. Mr. Flaherty mentioned that the Commission conducted a Site Visit earlier that day and he addressed several questions raised at the Site Visit.

Mr. Flaherty noted that the landscape design had slightly changed since the last meeting in order to comply with requirements set forth by the Natural Resources Commission (NRC). He explained the revised layout of the driveway and the stone wall by Lowell Road. The wall would be constructed with mortar on the inside to appear dry laid. The reconstructed wall would be approximately 24" tall. Mr. Flaherty noted that the pillars at the driveway entrance would be approximately 10" above the stone wall. A Commission Member reiterated the Commission's stance that the stone wall along the street should be a rustic, rural, loose, farmer style wall. Mr. Flaherty confirmed the design of the stone wall. Mr. Flaherty also advised the Commission that the two fieldstone walls proposed for the front yard were shifted slightly so that they were outside the 50' buffer zone set forth by NRC. The two fieldstone walls would have a more formal appearance compared to the rustic stone wall reconstructed along Lowell Road. One two-sided fieldstone wall would be constructed in front of the existing structure along the existing front walkway as indicated on revised site plan. A second new fieldstone wall would be constructed adjacent to the new wall along the walkway. The second fieldstone wall will be two-sided, and will include lighting fixtures. Downward bullet lighting fixtures will be also installed along the front walkway in the locations indicated on the lighting plan.

Mr. Bath pointed out that the 50' buffer zone caused the locations of the pool, fencing, and rear retaining walls to be shifted. Mr. Bath noted that the proposed swimming pool was narrower than initially proposed and as a result the fencing and rear stone walls had shifted closer to the rear of the structure. The details and materials of the fencing and rear stone retaining walls would remain the same as proposed. A Commission Member asked if the hot tub was still part of the proposal. Mr. Bath noted that a space was reserved for a hot tub but that it was not currently a priority for the homeowner.

A Commission Member opined that the pool house was visible from the river and reminded the Applicants to be aware of that. Commission Members discussed portions of the project that would and would not be visible.

The Chair opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time. Mr. Giddings moved to approve the Application as per the architectural plans and revised landscape plans submitted. Ms. Glenn seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The Chair then signed and dated the approved architectural plans and revised landscape plans.

Mr. Berrizbeitia left the meeting and did not return.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **Elise B. Stone on behalf of Archbishop of Boston Corp Sole, 12 Monument Square, Monument Square/North Bridge Historic District, for signage, paving and to install stone benches**

Elise Stone, Sandra Schelzi, Marilyn Mudry, and Gregory Burch appeared for the hearing and presented the Application.

Ms. Stone reviewed the proposed signage. The Applicants sought to install three new signs and relocate an existing sign. The first new sign proposed was an 8' wide by 2' high wall sign above the front entrance. The sign would feature a carved cross located above two lines of carved lettering. The top line of text was "Holy Family Parish" and the second line of text was "St. Bernard's Roman Catholic Church". The cross and lettering would be gold metallic paint and the background would be painted "Essex Green" with matte finish. Ms. Stone noted that several structures in Monument Square had signs of similar style and scale.

The second sign was a 24" wide by 36" high directory sign to replace the existing directory sign on the front façade. The Applicants noted that the current directory sign was approximately 20" wide by 33" high and the new directory sign would be about 20% larger. The proposed directory sign would be rectangular with scalloped corners. The new sign will be located to the left of the front door in the same location as the existing directory sign. The existing directory sign would be relocated to the rear façade of the building, just to the left of the rear entrance.

The third proposed sign was in the form of individual raised letters that spelled out "Holy Family Parish". The new lettering would be located below the cornice of the door surround on the rear entrance. The letters would be centered over the doors and be done in reserve prism carved letters in gold with a black outline. The lettering would be 8" high. The third sign area was approximately 33" wide by 10" high.

The Applicants reviewed the proposed paving changes for the apron at the rear entrance. The existing asphalt area in front of the rear steps was proposed to be replaced with new granite pavers. At the center of the landing, a solid 8' by 2' jet mist granite cross would be installed in the paving. The landing area would feature charcoal/onyx cobblestone border. Granite curbing would surround the planting areas and the accessible walkway to the rear door.

The Applicants sought to install three new granite benches at the site. One bench was proposed for the rear entrance to the right of the door. Two benches were proposed at the front entrance to the building under the two windows. The benches would have honed top and rough texture on sides. The Applicants noted that no engraving was currently planned for the benches. Ms. Mudry

stated that the proposed benches and paving area would create a more welcoming environment for Parishioners and the general public.

The Chair asked for comments from the Commission. One Commissioner wondered if other Churches had similar signage over their front entrances. Ms. Stone advised the Commissioner that there were several reasons why the Church sought to install a sign in that location. One reason was that there was no logical location for a freestanding sign due to the structure's close proximity to the street. Ms. Stone pointed out that many other Churches have freestanding signs because they actually had the space to install it. She noted that if Holy Family Parish were to install a freestanding sign, it would be located in the middle of the sidewalk. The same Commissioner asked the Applicants why they believed the scale of the proposed sign was appropriate for the building. The Applicants said that the scale of the proposed sign was based upon the guidance of their sign company (Crosby Design). Ms. Stone noted that the front entrance was higher than street level and that the size needed to be based on what people would actually be able to read from street level. Ms. Stone said another reason why the sign was proposed for this location was that the Church's name was not clearly identifiable. She cited several occasions when visitors or wedding guests were unable to locate the Church.

One Commission Member asked why the existing directory sign was being replaced with a slightly larger sign. Ms. Stone and Ms. Schelzi noted that the text of the existing sign was too small for people to read from the street. Ms. Schelzi noted that people had to walk up the front steps in order to read the directory sign. The same Commission Member expressed concern with the brightness of the gold lettering in the sign over the front entrance. Ms. Stone advised the Commission that she was trying to avoid yellow, white, or beige lettering for the sign and felt that the gold lettering was not as bright as it was shown in the renderings submitted with the Application.

One Commission Member asked if a sign had ever existed over the front door. The Applicants were unsure if a sign had previously existed in the proposed location.

Several Commission Members opined that a Site Visit was likely necessary. The Applicants and Commission spoke about several things that would be helpful for the Site Visit. One Commission Member felt that the proposed sign over the front entrance was substantial and suggested that the Applicants provide a scaled cardboard mock-up at the Site Visit.

The Chair opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time. A Site Visit was scheduled for Thursday, March 31st at 8:00 a.m. Further discussion was continued to the March 31, 2016 meeting.

**Mark Ward, 345 Lexington Road, American Mile Historic District, for alterations to front entryway and to replace window**

Mark Ward appeared for the hearing and presented the Application. The Applicant provided the Commission with a brief history of the structure and reviewed the existing conditions.

Mr. Ward presented the details of the proposed alterations to the front entrance. The Applicant sought to remove the existing entry on the left ell of existing structure and replace it with a projecting entrance vestibule. The new entry will project out 4' from the façade. The siding materials would match the existing structure. The trim would be painted white to match the existing structure. The roofing materials would be architectural asphalt shingles to match the

existing structure. The new entry will include a six panel door surrounded by side lights. The proposed entryway would have a 7' wide granite step. The Applicant stated that several structures along Lexington Road had similar entrances and referred to the photographs submitted with the Application. Mr. Ward believed that the current façade was very plain.

Mr. Ward also sought to replace the six over nine pane window to the right of the existing entrance. The Applicant sought to replace it with a Brosco True Divided Light Single Pane six over six Double Hung window painted to match the existing windows.

The Chair asked for comments from Commission Members. A Commission Member asked if any lighting was included with the new entrance. Mr. Ward said that building code required a light for any entrance. The Applicant indicated that he was considering different options for lighting. The Commission Member wondered if the Applicant had considered a recessed LED light set into the ceiling of the entry way. Mr. Ward expressed interest in the lighting suggestion.

Another Commissioner inquired about the door specifications for the new entrance. Mr. Ward did not have an exact model in mind but described the general characteristics of it. The Applicant said that door would likely be a Brosco model painted black with a storm door. The Commissioner noted that the Applicant would need to provide this information.

The Chair opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time. Although several Commission members thought that the proposed alterations were generally appropriate, the Commissioners believed that additional details regarding the front door and lighting should be provided and reviewed before any official vote is taken. Further discussion was continued to the March 31, 2016 meeting.

**SunBug Solar on behalf of Mark Brennan, 310 Lexington Road, American Mile Historic District, to install solar panels and storm doors**

Mark Brennan appeared for the hearing and presented the Application. Jamie Leigh of SunBug Solar was also in attendance. The Applicant sought approval to install solar panels on the rear roof of the existing structure and two storm doors.

Mr. Brennan reviewed the proposed storm doors. Mr. Brennan advised the Commission that two wood storm doors were manufactured by Seaport Shutters and will be painted brick red to match the existing doors. The two doors would have black screen inserts. Mr. Brennan reviewed photos of the door submitted with the Application.

Mr. Leigh reviewed the proposed solar panels array. 28 solar panels were proposed for the rear roof. Mr. Leigh opined that visual intrusion of the proposed installation was minimal at most. However, it was noted that the property abutted Town-owned land so the solar panels fell within the Commission's purview.

The Chair asked for comments from Commission Members. One Commission Member asked what the height of the solar panels was from the roof. Mr. Leigh stated that the height was 4.5". He said the panels would be flush with the roof pitch, and that the conduits would be buried in the roof and attic to make the layout appear seamless. Mr. Leigh told the Commission that the inverter would be located in the garage.

Several Commission Members discussed the visual impact of the solar panels from Lexington Road. The Commissioners believed that it would be rather difficult to see the panels from the

street. It was noted that the Town-owned abutting parcel was primarily wetlands and not a popular area for public use.

The Chair opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time. Mr. Giddings moved to approve the Application to install solar panels and storm doors as submitted. Ms. Glenn seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The Chair then signed and dated the approved solar panel layout plan.

### **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

#### **Concord Academy, 166 Main Street, Main Street Historic District, for construction of new vestibule entrances to the library building, installation of an accessible ramp to the library building, alteration of courtyard area and sidewalk location, new exterior lighting and modifications to previously approved design of new science building**

Don Kingman of Concord Academy appeared for the continued hearing. Also in attendance was Brian LaBau of Dewing Schmid Kearns Architects. Mr. Kingman briefly summarized the general details of the Application.

Chair Gregory noted that the Commission conducted a Site Visit earlier that day and asked if there were any comments from Commission Members. Several Commissioners opined that the Site Visit was very beneficial. At the request of one Commissioner, the Applicants clarified the proposed signage/lettering for the canopy portion of the vestibule entrance. The face of the canopy was 7" high and the raised lettering would be 4" high. Mr. Kingman noted that the style of the lettering would match existing lettering found throughout the campus.

Mr. Kingman mentioned that the only change from the submitted plans was the addition of a center railing on the stairs leading to the Main School entrance.

The Chair opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time. Mr. Giddings moved to approve the Application as submitted with the inclusion of a center handrail on the stairs leading to the Main School entrance. Ms. Glenn seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The Chair then signed and dated the approved plans.

Mr. Giddings moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Glenn seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The Meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew W. Mara  
Administrative Assistant

Minutes Approved on: July 7, 2016

Nea Glenn, Secretary